

To: Niiya, Karen@Waterboards[Karen.Niiya@waterboards.ca.gov]
Cc: Grover, Joshua@Wildlife[Joshua.Grover@wildlife.ca.gov]; Foresman, Erin[Foresman.Erin@epa.gov]; roger_guinee@fws.gov[roger_guinee@fws.gov]; Melanie Harrison - NOAA Federal[melanie.harrison@noaa.gov]
From: Ryan Wulff - NOAA Federal
Sent: Wed 6/18/2014 7:08:00 PM
Subject: Re: Agencies Coordination Meeting - Bay-Delta Plan Phase 2 Issues

Karen,

While you are correct that I am the appropriate NMFS contact for Phase II, the right NMFS representative for the meeting you are proposing is Melanie Harrison. She is cc'd here.

Regards,
Ryan

On Wed, Jun 11, 2014 at 10:04 AM, Niiya, Karen@Waterboards
<Karen.Niiya@waterboards.ca.gov> wrote:

You are receiving this email because I understand that you are the staff contact at your agency for the State Water Board's Phase II Review and Update to the Bay-Delta Plan. If you are not the correct contact for your agency, please forward this email to the appropriate person.

State Water Board staff have been working on the scientific basis for updating the objectives in the 2006 Bay-Delta Plan and could use feedback from the fishery agencies on certain issues. We anticipate there will be a series of scientific meetings, similar to the 2nd Tuesday Agencies Coordination Meetings/Agencies Working Meetings that had been implemented for our Phase I review.

We have a current need for fishery agency feedback on the dissolved oxygen objective of 6 mg/l in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel near Turner Cut. The State Water Board's record shows that this objective was established in the 1991 Bay-Delta Plan to prevent the development of migration barriers to fall-run Chinook adult migration in the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel. Prior to the establishment of the objective, the dissolved oxygen concentrations in the Stockton DWSC had periodically dipped below 5 mg/l. The hearing record for the 1991 Bay-Delta Plan indicates that the Board relied upon a 1968 Memorandum of Understanding between CDFG (now CDFW), Department of Water Resources, Bureau of Reclamation and US FWS, which recommended using 6 mg/l. The memorandum indicated these agencies would review this recommendation in 1976 if the Peripheral Canal was not operational by that time. Attached is a pdf document containing the 1968 Memorandum and an excerpt from the SWRCB's 1991 Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan that describes the dissolved oxygen issues.

We would like to coordinate with the fishery agencies to learn whether additional information has been developed since 1991 to help develop a recommendation regarding whether there is a need to revise the dissolved oxygen objective for the Stockton Deep Water Ship Channel.

Please respond to this email **by Wednesday, June 18** with contact information for those people at your agency that could help the discussion regarding this subject. I will follow-up with a coordination email with potential appointment dates.

Potential topics for discussion include:

1. Is the 6 mg/l objective too high? Literature from the 1991 review indicates 5 mg/l is adequate to provide passage.
2. Is there new science that we should consider?
3. Has the 1968 memorandum been superceded with a more recent agreement?